



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES OF CASES.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT SIMILAR TO PROVISION IN OTHER STATE CONSTITUTIONS.—Where a constitutional amendment is adopted, similar to provisions in several State Constitutions, the court cannot presume that the amendment was taken from a particular State, so as to adopt the construction put upon it by the courts of that State. *Voss v. Waterloo Water Co.* (Ind.), 71 N. E. 208.

CRIMINAL LAW—HOMICIDE—FAILURE TO FURNISH MEDICINE.—Conscientious religious belief against the use of medicines for the cure of disease seems to be no defense to a prosecution for involuntary manslaughter of an infant, for which defendant was bound to care, and which died for want of medical attendance. *State v. Chenowith* (Ind.), 71 N. E. 197, citing 8 Am. & Eng. Encyc. of Law (2d ed.) 298, 299; 20 Am. & Eng. Encyc. of Law (1st ed.), 769 *et seq.*; *Reynolds v. United States*, 98 U. S. 745, 25 L. Ed. 244; *Miles v. United States*, 103 U. S. 304, 26 L. Ed. 481; *Specht v. Com.*, 49 Am. Dec. 518; *Com. v. Plaisted*, 148 Mass. 375, 19 N. E. 224, 2 L. R. A. 142; 12 Am. St. Rep. 566; *Regina v. Downes*, 13 Cox, C. C. 111; *Regina v. Senior* (1899), 1 Q. B. 283; 1 Bishop, New Cr. Law, 344; *People v. Pierson* (N. Y.), 68 N. E. 243.

See, also, article on Christian Science and the Law, 10 Va. Law Reg. 285.

THE RIGHT OF TRADING IN YOUR OWN NAME.—An interesting article on this subject in Law Notes for July, 1904, shows the principles of law governing this subject to be as follows:

Nobody has any right to represent his goods to be the goods of somebody else—in other words, in the use of a name, there must be no deception; and, if there is, it is immaterial whether the deception arises from the use of a name, which, as it happens, is the name of the defendant, or whether it arises from the use of any other name or description. *Reddaway v. Banham* (1896), A. C. 199; *The Valentine Meat Juice Company v. Valentine Extract Company, Limited*, 83 L. T. 259.

There is no need in cases of this class for the plaintiff to prove any actual intent on the part of the defendant to pass the goods off as the plaintiff's. Such an intent by itself probably gives no right of action. *Lever v. Bedingfield*, 80 L. T. 100. What must be proved, and what is sufficient to secure an injunction, is that the natural result of the defendant's conduct will be to pass off his goods as the goods of the plaintiff. *Cellular Clothing Co. v. Maxton and Murray* (1899), A. C. 326; *Millinton v. Fox*, 3 My. and Cr. 388. See also *Pinet et Cie v. Maison Louis Pinet* (1898), 1 Ch. 179; *Cash, Lim. v. Cash*, 86 L. T. 211; *Jamieson v. Jamieson*, 15 Rep. Pat. Cas. 169; *Chivers v. Chivers*, 17 R. P. C. 420; *Trufit v. Edney*, 20 R. P. C. 321.